



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1326TX-1 for George Gervin Youth Center, Inc.

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>1. The applicant provides a detailed narrative as to how the program was created. For example, the applicant indicates the project was developed, created, designed and tested by the four primary LEA's responsible for bringing the 24 participating schools together and as such represents the views of the parents, students and educators within the 24 schools who answered survey questions, worked together in focused groups. In addition the applicant indicates the four core educational assurance areas were the center of consideration. The applicant provides a very detailed chart with a column indicating the Race to the Top Assurance area, the current practice of the target schools and the third column the Race to the Top plan. For example, Assurance Area: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; Current Practice: Each State in this grant have statewide college- and career standards, however, not every school has communicated these standards to all students, teachers and parents; Race To The Top Plans: Established common language among all targeted schools around the issue of standards and assessments. 2. Train all schools' leadership team on the type of assessments and the use of the assessment data to inform all levels of instruction for all students. 3. Monitor the use of the all RTTT assessments to ensure fidelity in all LEA's. The plan shows excellent planning.</p> <p>The applicant lacks information in this section as how they plan to turning around lowest-achieving schools. The applicant provides narratives indicating seven of the 24 schools are in various stages of transformation with school improvement initiatives, but do not provide information as to what kind of transformation has taken place. The applicant also indicates significant progress has been made in all seven (7) schools but give no details.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent narrative showing each of the 24 schools that have been identified meet the race to the top absolute priority 4 and minimum of 40% low-income/poverty rate and is qualified to be a Race to the Top campus with a strong record of success with our country's most at risk students. In addition, the applicant indicates there will be 4,679 participating students from the 24 participating schools, 84.81% of the 4,679 participating students are from low-income families based on free or reduced-price lunch subsidies exceeding the 40% minimum Race To The Top requirement. The applicant identifies the 8 Leas with the corresponding 24 schools. In addition, Accelerating student achievement, and deepening student learning while increasing equity through personalized student support, is more easily achieved when parents and students have a highlevel of ownership in the data that represents the students' personalized academic achievement and performance levels. Each LEA as a member of the Personalized Learning Consortium has in place an interoperable data system that includes student basic demographic information.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent explanation of this portion of the application. For example, the</p>		

applicant points out the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning System is the LEA-wide reform and change plan that will result in meaningful, sustainability reforms that have the potential to lend support to LEA's beyond the participating schools.

The goals and guidance are connected to the State of Texas' model for transformation based upon the Texas Title I Priority Schools research and implementation results that have led to a focus on LEA-owned model of reform rather than a campus-level model of reform. The applicant indicates research shows the LEA must share in the ownership of the reform that is needed in order to better guarantee successful implementation of the reform model at the campus level. The applicant further explains, seven critical success factors form the basis for the plan for guaranteeing that MAP-LS will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support all participating LEA's and included support systems, clearly defined outcomes and activities that involve improving academic performance through data-drive instruction, curriculum alignment, on-going monitoring of instruction, increasing the use of quality data, increasing leadership effectiveness, increase learning time, increase parent and community involvement.

The applicant also provides details on the plan for ensuring that each student has an effective teacher and each school is led by an effective principal is to implement the highly successful Educator Effectiveness Process. EEP is a United States Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund project that has shown a great deal of success during the past two years of implementation in ten (10) Texas charter school organizations.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides narrative indicating the goals listed are ambitious but achievable and attainable for all 24 schools, 4,679 students over 250 educators supported by the parents and the community partnerships. The applicant then proceeds to explain the plan and why it is an excellent goal. The goals information in this section is also supported by the information requested in the charts located in Selection Criteria A, Selection Criteria B and Selection Criteria E, performance measures.

For example, turning around our lowest-achieving schools. Selection criteria B highlights a clear record of success for the eight LEA's that make up the Personalized Learning Consortium including the seven lowest-achieving schools that are a part of the 24 campus participating in this application for funding. The clear record of success that supports the fact that the LEA's have been successful at turning around the lowest-achieving school is evident in several significant ways. A clear example is data that highlights that the George Gervin Academy improved its dropout rate from 29% to zero in under a year. The applicant shows implementing MAP-LS across the 8 LEA's will result in – 90% of all students becoming proficiency on all summative assessments by the end of year of each year and or having measurable academic growth gains that are at least one standard error above average one year's gain.

Decreasing achievement gap – For those students who have been chronically low-achievers, we expect 90% of the lowest performing students, with accelerated instruction to make 2.66 years gain. This is achievable based upon experience with American Reading Company's (ARC)'s Action 100 Response To Intervention program where on average students engaged in Action 100's response to intervention are guaranteed to make 2.66 years gain in one year of instruction.

Graduation Rates – The applicant expect to graduate no less than 90% of students who are enrolled in LEA's campuses where there is instruction to students enrolled in 7th – 12th based upon national definition of dropouts that calculates the graduation rate as the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined in the Race to the Top District application notice.

College enrollment – 90% of graduating seniors will enroll in college within 16 months of graduating from high school. This ambitious but achievable goal will be possible because part of the MAP-LS plan will include provisions for accelerating instruction to all students who in the past might have been disenfranchised and never realized the college was a possibility.

The applicant does an excellent job explaining why these goals are achievebeable.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)



	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides credible information a clear track of success. For example, the applicant provides a chart showing State Recognized Gold Acknowledgment for Attendance (2010), Commendable summative data results for students in social studies, State Recognized Gold Acknowledgment for recommended high school program, Texas Success Initiative for Mathematics; score 2 standard errors above to become a "5" growth model school based upon student achievement, sponsors \$20 million college extravaganza each year for hundreds of students to be able to afford to go to college and other recognition.</p> <p>Improve student learning: The eight LEA's that make up the consortium have had a long history of success when compared to the State. The chart below highlights each LEA's performance GAINS in all tested subjects. Where there is no percentage, the actual numbers of students testing were below the threshold required in order to avoid any FERPA violations of confidentiality. Houston Heights school consistently averaged 70% per more than the state each year and this year earned the title of National Distinguished Title I and is on the short list to become a Blue Ribbon performance school, one of the highest recognition that a school can achieve.</p> <p>In addition, Over the past six years, the LEA's that are participating as a Consortium for the purpose of the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems, MAP-LS have achieved success with several reforms to improve performance in the lowest achieving schools. Specifically, campuses under the George Gervin Youth Center, Higgs, Carter, King Academy and Radiance Academy implemented the three - year comprehensive reform by becoming an Accelerated Schools Process (ASP) school where all stakeholders are involved in the governance process to improve the school.</p> <p>The applicant also provides ample information on how it makes data available to all stake holders. For example, Information is available to the public in several different ways. The publicly available resource compliance documents include: the Texas Education Agency Code (TEC); Texas Administrative Code (TAC); State Financial Accounting Resource Handbook (FARS guide); the AEIS annual district and campus report cards; the NCLB district and campus report card; Quarterly Solvency Reports; Annual Budgets; Annual Audits; Annual Tax Returns; Board Approved published salary scale; Governance report; required Public Hearings, newsletters; emails; state and school websites; Human Resource Departments; regular post office letters; Educational Service Centers; Association of Charter Schools and the Arizona Board of Education.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a clear plan as to how they will involved in the process stakeholders. In addition, the applicant says in order to accelerate achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity across all subgroups, our continuous improvement plan includes: comprehensive data analysis; investment in technology to link instructional resources to student needs on a data dashboard. However, the subgroups are not identified.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides narrative showing over the past six years, the LEA's that are participating as a Consortium for the purpose of the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems, have achieved success with several reforms to improve performance in the lowest achieving schools. Specifically, campuses under the George Gervin Youth Center, Higgs, Carter, King Academy and Radiance Academy implemented the three - year comprehensive reform by becoming an Accelerated Schools Process school where all stakeholders are involved in the governance process to improve the school.</p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent explanation of the training teachers participate in the accelerate training. For example through the Accelerated Schools Process all educators receive training in Powerful Learning's five components and integrate the research-based instruction into the classrooms and lessons. The applicant has included this reform process as part of the plan. The Educator Effectiveness Process ( is the most recent ambitious reform that has shown promising results for achieving significant gains in student academic performances and educator quality through ,</p>		

systematic, regular teacher and principal observations and evaluations. The plan is very well written and easy to understand. As proof the effectiveness of the program the applicant provides a narrative indicating an educator effectiveness initiative of Youth Empowerment Services, Inc., EEP has in one year of full implementation helped three local charter schools achieve AYP status after they were more than three years of not meeting AYP.

The appendices include information about EEP, the core processes, the 2011-2012 payout for teachers and principals and the EEP at-a-glance document that depicts the complete implementation cycle of EEP.

Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only are located in the Human Resources on personnel action forms, Annual published School Report Card, Published Salary Scale; on the schools website; (c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only are located in the Human Resources on personnel action forms, Annual School Report Card AEIS, and through the Published Salary Scale; the budget on the schools website; (d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level in the accounting department on the financial statements published monthly and as needed, Annual School Report Card AEIS, Annual School Budget, School website, Annual Tax Returns, Reported on the state data base. The applicant provides excellent information on transparency.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: The successful conditions that enable autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in this MAPS- LS Race to the Top proposal is outlined in Chapter 12 of the Texas Education Code specifically outlining that Charter Schools are autonomous, independent and open-enrollment. Appendix 13 has additional details. Each LEA has the sufficient autonomy to create and implement the personalized learning environments as described in this MAP-LS Race to the Top application. Examples of this autonomy can be seen in the ability of the primary LEA's to develop and implement the EEP program which includes a completely new teacher and principal evaluation system as well as the completely new Performance Based Compensation System (PBCS) which has allowed schools to make significant improvements to the instructional programs. The applicant provides credible evidence of autonomy to operate the program.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides ample details on stakeholder engagement. the preliminary decision was made by the four primary LEA's (HCK, GGYC, ACT and RA), contact was made with the remaining four LEA's (Houston Heights, Comquest, Shekinah Radiance, and Barack Obama Green High School) Superintendents. Then each of the eight LEA Superintendents met with their teachers and principals and scheduled parent meetings and students meetings to gather input into the design and creation of MAP-LS. A survey was conducted among 23 campuses, focus groups were held with teachers and students. The Appendix includes the sign-ins from the parent meetings and each week during the MAP-LS Race to the Top Superintendent's Meetings, the superintendents shared information related to the surveys, focus groups and conversations that were being held with all stakeholders. In addition, all 24 campuses turned in their "educator buy-ins". Ninety-eight percent (98%) of all educators have bought into the implementation of MAP-LS on their campuses. This is 18% more than the minimum of 70% that is required. Adjustments were made during the writing of this application to include comments, input and suggestions from students and teachers. Each LEA played an active role in giving feedback, providing information and garnering support. (i) Collective bargaining - Non-applicable- Texas is not a collective-bargaining state (ii) Evidence that at least 70 percent of the teacher from participating schools support the proposals. - In the Appendix are copies of teacher buy-in forms which documents the 98% vote to fully support the survey results. The applicant provides ample details on collective bargaining. The applicant provides a chart with letters of support for the program.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant indicates Maximized Accelerated Performance Learning System will collectively and collaboratively maximize each day's lessons to each student so that all students receive accelerated instruction through personalized lessons within in a systemic plan that will institutionalize the learning system for all students so that our lowest achieving schools and students can experience success and be college-and career-ready upon graduation. The applicant identifies needs and gaps and how they were used to creatively design the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems plan for this race to the top application. The applicant connected priority needs to the project budgets to ensure the identification of the funds needed to meet the program. Meeting the identified priority needs and filling the gaps the needs represent will ensure that MAP-LS is successful and ensuring that each school races to the top and becomes and then is sustained as a "high performance school". A chart highlights the priority needs and how the MAP-LS budget addresses the needs/gaps. For example, the chart shows MAP-LS Identified Needs/Gaps: The need for each student to have effective and highly effective educators leading their classrooms and their schools is one of the most critical needs. The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) will ensure that all participating schools have access to this process that will train and prepare staff through a) a comprehensive performance based system that rewards and recognizes effective educators for improving student level and school level value added performance, b) a comprehensive observation/ evaluation system that focuses on the communication and implementation of a personalized system that has well-established research based standards that are fair and transparent for all educators and focuses on providing on-going support and guidance with job embedded professional development at the core of the learning for all teachers. The section on Project Budget: Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) – over \$3.9 million dollars over four years targeted over 250 teachers, 24 schools and 24 principals and 8 superintendents. Value added data training and support included.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides an excellent narrative in this section. For example, the applicant indicates the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems (MAP-LS) initiative includes successful strategies that are straightforward, research-based, and proven to accelerate teacher effectiveness and accelerate student growth. One of the major needs and gaps experienced by the LEA's that have formed the Alliance/Consortium is the need to have institutionalized, consistent systems of excellence so that all educators and students have access every school year to effective educators engaged in research-based effective practices that guarantee that student performance improves towards the goal of 100% college- and career ready and personalized learning. However, the applicant does provide specific identifiable steps and components to achieve the goals.Excellent written but little details. The participation of parents in decision making is not clear or missing all together</p> <p>The applicant does a good job of describing how educators will be rewarded for increasing educator effectiveness while improving student performance and effective educators will be recruited, b) educators will be developed and retained using a fair and transparent yet comprehensive evaluation / observations system, c) educators will participated in professional development based upon the needs identified through the observation system with a focus on job-embedded professional development and finally d) educators will have multiple opportunities to be retained in instructional leadership roles based upon increased educator effectiveness.</p> <p>The applicant does not show what steps will be taken to insure proper mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided. The application offers more philosophy than facts in this section.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant takes you through the narrative pointing out the steps in this section of the application. For example, MAP-LS' plan for ensuring that each student has an effective teacher and each school is lead by an effective principal in order to reach the college and career readiness standards and graduation requirements is to implement the highly successful Educator Effectiveness Process. EEP is a United States Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund project that has shown a great deal of success during the past two years of implementation in ten Texas charter school organizations. Each LEA is committed to implementing EEP's four core processes beginning with the notification of funding. Currently, six of the 24 targeted campuses are in various stages of implementing EEP and remaining 18 campuses will join in implementing EEP so that a) educators will be rewarded for increasing educator effectiveness while improving student performance and effective educators will be recruited, b) educators will be developed and retained using a fair and transparent yet comprehensive evaluation / observations system, c) educators will participated in professional development based upon the needs identified through the observation system with a focus on job-embedded professional development and finally d) educators will have multiple opportunities to be retained in instructional leadership roles based upon increased educator effectiveness.

Throughout several months of working sessions and meetings, the PLC Executive Committee consisting of the four primary LEA's adopted standards and assessments that lend credence and credibility to the academic improvements we envision for all of the participating PK - 12th grade students. STANDARDS - Each state (Texas, Arizona, and New Jersey) has adopted mandatory "standards" that each school is required to use to a) guide instruction for all Pre-Kinder through 12th grade students as well as b) college- and career ready standards. These standards will serve as the "basis" for MAP-LS' plan to prepare students to be ready to graduate on time or early and ready to compete in our global society, college- and career ready. The Texas standards include readiness standards, supporting standards and process standards while the New Jersey standards are the Common Core Standards which are widely recognized as appropriate standards for college and career readiness.

Educators, students and parents will be taught and trained how to use the college and career readiness standards and graduation requirements to guide personalized learning activities so that valid information and data is used to inform decisions that will lead to improved academic performances.

Two basic types of assessments will be utilized to generate credible data related to student performances in all academic subjects and grade levels: summative and formative assessments. MAP-LS defines summative assessments as "end-of-the-year" tests/exams that all students are required to take from PK-12 grade to demonstrate grade level achievement or "above" grade level achievement based each student's individualized needs. The goals and objectives in MAP-LS are designed to guarantee that each student make progress each year towards achieving 90% or better proficiency on all summative assessments given at the end of each school year before students leave for their summer break. With an emphasis on meaningful, parental and family support, Parent Advancement Program is a comprehensively designed parent involvement program that helps parents learn

to appreciate the value of a "good" education so that they can transfer their learning to their children. This transfer of "education value" serves as a positive reinforcement to students who will arrive at school each day learning from their teachers to value education and then the same students will return home and learn from their parents the value of a "good education".

The applicant also indicates mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provide for them. the crux of MAP-LS program is to provide all educators with relevant, meaningful professional development opportunities that prepare educators to successful implement the following objective priorities. When our LEA's educators are well- trained they are better able to communicate their learning to the students, parents and families that they support. So in addition to the student focused objectives that follow, the final objective is a focus on advancing parent's meaningful participation so that the parents can value education at the same level of intensity and urgency the educators.

The applicant indicates in order to close achievement gaps will use the implementation of MAP-LS, to ensure mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. Based upon the research-based activities and strategies we will be implementing, students will have multiple mechanisms in place to guarantee that they have "superior support" designed to

guarantee an understanding of how to use the tools and resources that will be provide to track and manage their lives.

The applicant indicates educators from each campus spend 6 – 8 weeks each summer in high-quality professional development training sessions, they will be trained on all of the tools and resources that students will be exposed to so that the educators are prepared to train and provide superior support to all students.

# D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides excellent details on the governance of the program. For example, the Memorandum of Understanding has been designed as the governance document for the Personalized Learning Consortium and will hold all eight LEA's accountable for implementing this initiative in a very unique way by requiring a unanimous vote on. The program will have an Executive Committee of the consortium and are required to vote on any and all matters related to this Race to the Top initiative. Each Executive Committee LEA is committed to attending 100% of all required meetings and training sessions and each LEA will have input and vote on when and where required meetings and trainings will take place</p> <p>Each of the campuses in the consortium has their own autonomous Leadership Team with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, personnel, staffing, roles and responsibilities, and budget.</p> <p>The applicant provides a chart showing the Executive Committee consisting of the four primary LEA's reviewed, discussed and then voted on the required demonstration of activities below with the following tentative timeline based upon approval for funding. Each of the campuses in the consortium has their own autonomous Leadership Team with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, personnel, staffing, roles and responsibilities, and budget. The leadership of the program will be a MAP-LS Commissioner. The Commissioner will be charged with overseeing all MAP-LS activities, tasks and responsibilities as described in this application and will answer directly to the four primary LEA's.</p> <p>The Educator Effectiveness Process is a very interesting component of the program. The applicant explains this program has shown promising results for achieving significant gains in student academic performances and educator quality through 1). systematic, regular teacher and principal observations and evaluations, 2). Implementation of comprehensive professional development system which integrates Job-Embedded professional development (during weekly meetings) with EEP professional development on the EEP system and targeted Professional Development to fulfill campus, principal, and teacher improvement needs.</p> <p>The applicant also indicates it will make student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services. All summative state student assessment data is provided to parents and students at this time as required by the state, however, this initiative will dramatically improve this process of training and utilizing data, making the information more understandable, available, and useful to both parents and students.</p> <p>The application speaks of LEA and Consortium practices, policies, rules but does give any information or details on this very important segments. Although there is an executive committee of four people, there a Commissioner and the lead MAP-LS staff. This person will oversee 100% of the activities, day-to-day duties and tasks of five (5) expert-level master educators in leading MAP-LS. Considering the size of the job this will a very difficult to keep inform and organize.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides narrative indicating because each of the schools involved is currently a public</p>		

charter school funded through state and federal funding sources, all schools have similar consistent funding streams to provide the basic supplies and facilities necessary to provide the necessary tools and supplies as well as online access while at school. Additional support to make these resources available and accessible will be provided through effective, research based strategies. The entire program will be operated and managed by the Commissioner in charge.

The Commissioner is total charge and will work closely Wexford, a management company of educational resources. Although the company mentioned a number of time in the application it is not clear what Wexford role is and how the Commissioner will interact with them.

The applicant provides an excellent chart that highlights the funds that have been allocated to support each LEA's ability and capacity to fulfill all of the requirements of the MOU for MAP-LS. In addition a significant amount of time and energy will be expended by Wexford Inc as they carry out all day-to-day project monitoring, all data collection on all aspects of the initiative, complete ROI modeling for the training enterprise, and day-to-day monitoring of the project goals, objectives and performance measures. The applicant however does not explain how the job of Wexford will be carried out, nor exactly what the plan is for the near future.

The Commissioner is responsible for ensuring that the LEA's students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, through a variety of strategies including the possibilities of peer support, online support or campus-based, local support as designed in this application. The effort is to make sure parents and students can transport their information using technology. However, no explanation or details are provided as to how this will be done.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<div>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</div> <p>The applicant does an excellent job in this section. The applicant narrates The Personalized Learning Consortium behind the MAP --LS initiative will use as part of the overall management process, a Total Quality Management (TQM) approach, which is linked closely with the American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) initiative. This approach incorporates the use of evaluation data into project realignment, utilizing a continuous improvement process, as well as, feeding information into the evaluation process (Plan/Do/Study/Act processes), providing just in time information to the project so improvements can be made. The evaluation and continuous improvement process will provide the initiative with valuable information with respect to several key operational and outcome related issues, including: 1) management structure and effectiveness; 2) degree to which the project meets all goals and objectives, customer (district) satisfaction, and perception of the utility and effectiveness of services; and 3) outcomes related to the models of supportive pay for teachers and principals. The evaluation process will link to the TQM approach providing feedback from formative data collection and analysis, summative data, forming the basis for quality outcomes. Data collection will include: 1) descriptive data – to describe the interventions and activities that are conducted, and who is participating in them; 2) quality analysis data -- to determine the quality of each intervention, activity, resource and service; 3) implementation analysis data – to determine how well each of these is being implemented and the degree of implementation of each; 4) outcome analysis data to determine project outcomes, including those related to Performance Measures; and, 5) Return on Investment analysis data to determine the cost benefit of various components of the project.</p> <p>The initiative proposes to add new components and reforms to the schools’ education systems in order to increase the focus of teachers and principal’s work, and to improve the flow and analysis of information to increase productivity. The initiative will develop models for distributed leadership, and explicit protocols for leading grade-level learning teams that will be developed and implemented across the entire district PLCs. The sustainability of grade-level teams and across district teams through PLCs depends on coherence with district policies and practices that the initiative’s districts will develop, maintain and monitor.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent description of this section of the plan. The initiative will use a structured engagement management model (aligned with TQM principals) in its ongoing communication and engagement plan. The model is designed to manage processes and people with specific emphasis on communicating effectively with both internal and external constituents. In addition, the initiative will develop a strategic communications plan, a refinement of the initial communication plan already drafted by various partners of the MAPS-LS Alliance. By developing a strategic communications plan, the applicant will be revisiting the plans for fine-tuning and mid-course corrections. The applicant indicates they will also conduct communication audits to track where they want to go next and to assess the current communication practices and highlight areas that need improvement. During the planning process, the applicant gathered and analyzed all of the communications the Alliance districts currently use. The applicant included special events and small group meeting to communications tactics with external audiences. The applicant was able to get a picture of the communication conduits that are currently use and then better understood the audience/purpose, reach, cost and staff time. The applicant also examined the balance between print, digital and face to face communications and the balance between audiences reach.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides numerous charts showing the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroups whose teachers of record and principal are highly effective teachers and a highly effective principals. The applicant identifies the applicable population thusly: All participating students base. This base will represent all subgroups with the rest of the selected population. The applicant provides all information required in this section. However, the applicant does not include a narrative with additional details along with the charts to give a more clear explanation of what the charts say indicate and differentiate among the different group of students.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an excellent explanation of the components of the plan. The MAPS-LS Alliance will utilize a focused evaluation in coordination with project staff an stakeholders. The design is robust and cost effective and framed by the project indicators, project and program focused evaluation questions, and is linked to key elements of a Total Quality Management strategy. Project measures were developed with the proposal planning team and have shaped the development of this initiative. Through a data-feedback-revision/planning cycle (based on TQM), the evaluation will support continuous data integration into decision making at all levels, and processes to use this data for improvement throughout the grant period. The design includes benchmarks to monitor progress on meeting milestones, and a summative evaluation design to assess the performance measure and on student outcomes. Wexford Inc will collect, synthesize, and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data to track outcomes and relationships between teacher and principal effectiveness indicators and student achievement, and other intended and unintended consequences of program participation. Since the project includes multiple charter districts, it is essential that early formative data be collected to ensure the project is meeting its milestones according to timelines and to make decisions that ensure immediate and long-term success in achieving outcomes. The evaluation facilitates the successful collection of this data, beginning with input from stakeholder groups and service providers (via an online portal and project meetings), and establishes a process by which project staff can use data to make timely program adjustments</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides documentation of the budget of the program. The applicant provides some details and figures of the expected costs of the various components of the program. A budget chart is provided showing the main costs of the project. However, the applicant does not provide an adequate budget narrative showing details on expenditures and justification of the amounts requested. The budget lacks coherence and details on reasoning behind requested amounts.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides narrative and a flow chart showing how the District will try to sustain the program once federal dollars are gone. The applicant shows once fully implemented the district will be able to maintain the program at the highest levels with a minimum investment. Teachers, instructional coaches, administrators, and parents will have the capability to support a Learner-Centered system once the funds made available are expended.</p> <p>However, the applicant does not provide a clear plan with details as to where the funds will come to continue the program. The only thing the applicant indicates is that it will be able to cover the costs involved with the continuation of the project. Details are missing to justify the claim.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides convincing data showing how it will meet the requirements of the competitive preference priority. For example, the applicant indicates as part of the application process the district will build long term partnerships that will provide a foundation to expand the career development of every high school. The community has already made a significant commitment to expanding student opportunities in this area. The district completed a strategic planning process during the spring of 2012. the district will be seeking funds to build an afterschool program at each participating site. The program will be designed to provide three basic services; the first includes direct interventions for students in areas that have been identified as deficient in the common unit assessments. The second is to provide a location and time to receive homework help.</p> <p>The district will develop a data base that will define the enrichment opportunities. The site coordinators, school PTA's and school to career will also support in this effort. Once the model is built every student will have the opportunity to attend the afterschool program. Program interventions will focus on the students with the greatest need. The after school staff will actively recruit students to participate in the project. The District will be responsible to develop a consortium of community partners that would include several hundred businesses and community organizations who will serve as the center of the school to career resource pool. The applicant provides a chart identifying desired results and goals.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide details on how they will use available data and resources to achieve the expected results and goals. Some of the narrative only mentions what they would like to see occur but do not provide details as to how they will achieve the goals or the mechanics behind some of the plan.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		

This applicant has met this priority because the applicant has provided a clear plan coherently and comprehensively built on the core educational assurances areas. For example, the Personalized Learning Consortium's is in support of comprehensive education reform and seeks to guarantee each participating Pre-Kinder – 12th grade student Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems so that they are prepared to graduate from high school on time college- and career ready

The applicant has created a learning environment that has been designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, or college. Secondly, the applicant indicates they will utilize and build data systems that measure student growth and success while informing educators (teachers, principals and Superintendents), students and parents with relevant, reliable data allowing everyone to be informed about how to personally improve instruction that leads to student academic growth and ultimately improved student academic performances.

Thirdly, the applicant described throughout this application they will focus on recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective educators (teachers, principals and Superintendents) so that every student has an effective teacher being a significant factor in the student's academic success.

The steps to achieve this are clearly described within the application in detail.

Total	210	165
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1326TX-2 for George Gervin Youth Center, Inc.

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., generally describes a Personalized Learning Consortium (PLCs) vision that supports education reform for each participating Pre-Kinder-12th grade student in Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems (MAP-LS). The applicant generally describes its vision that was developed, created, designed, and tested by the four primary LEA's responsible for bringing the 24 participating schools together. The vision represents the views of the parents, students, and educators within the 24 schools who answered survey questions, worked together in focused groups, participated in interviews and expressed their thoughts, their ideas, and their concerns for comprehensive education reform.

The applicant generally describes its work in the four core educational areas and aligns each of these areas to the current practice and the Race To The Top plans.

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy - The applicant clearly indicates that currently each state in this grant (Arizona, New Jersey, Texas) has statewide college-and career-standards, but not every school has communicated these standards to all students, teachers, and parents. Currently, all schools have some form of assessments, but there is a lack of consistency in using assessment data and applying the assessment data uniformly across all grades and subject areas. The applicant describes a vision through this proposal to establish common language among all targeted schools around the issue of standards and assessments; train all schools' leadership team on the type of assessments and the use of assessment data to inform instruction; monitor the use of all RTTT assessments; and ensure that assessment activities lead to preparing students to be college- and career-ready upon graduation from high school on time.
2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers, principals, superintendents with data

about how they can improve instruction - The applicant indicates that currently all schools have interoperable data through the state/LEA-wide systems; no schools utilize the data with students, parents, and teachers with immediate access on demand; all schools have the ability to utilize interoperable data to personalize data access by students and parents; and all students are linked together with class roster that are checked and reviewed for accuracy throughout the school year. The applicant has a vision through this proposal to train all school on the use of interoperable data so that students, parents, and teachers have data-on-demand to inform instruction; train all students on the use of the systems so that they can manipulate the data; ensure that all data systems have teacher and students connectivity so that teachers can see the student data; and ensure that all students have data notebooks and train teachers on how to train students on the use of these notebooks.

3. Recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers, principals, and superintendents - The applicant indicates that seven of the 24 schools are in different phases of implementing the highly successful Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP); all remaining 20 targeted schools have committed to implementing EEP with RTTT funding; and no superintendent evaluation system is operational in the LEA's. The applicant provides a vision indicating that all 20 targeted schools will receive the training and support to implement the teacher and principal Educator Effective Process; and all targeted LEA's will work together to ensure that by 2015, a Superintendent Evaluation System is operational in all 8 LEA's. The applicant does not present a clear vision on the specific teacher evaluation process in order to reward and retain effective teachers.
4. Turning around the lowest-achieving schools - Currently, the applicant indicates that 7 of the 24 schools are in various stages of transformation with school improvement initiatives. The applicant generally states that RTTT funding will ensure that all schools are prepared to improve so that each school is a high performance school where all students are college- and career-ready. The applicant did not provide a clear vision on the strategies that will be utilized in order to turn around the lowest-achieving schools.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant did provide a vision on adopting standards and assessments as well as building data systems. The applicant did not articulate a clear reform vision or approach to the teacher and principal evaluation process or in turning around the lowest-achieving schools.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning System (MAP-LS) was designed and created because the four (4) LEA's experienced a need to transform and reform their school districts. The remaining LEA's asked to be a part of this application.

(a) Each of the 24 schools that have been identified meet the Race to the Top Absolute Priority 4 with a minimum of 40% low-income/poverty rate. Each of the LEA's representing the 24 schools have signed a MOU. Each LEA has agreed that 24 schools will be the maximum number of schools that can participate and no school will be allowed to opt out of the grant when funded for any reason. Each LEA has agreed to review additional schools' request to become a part of the Personalized Learning Consortium to implement MAP-LS after the four-year grant period and the three-year sustainability period have been completed.

(b) The applicant provides a list of the following eight LEA's and 24 schools that will participate in the grant activities: Academy of Careers and Technology (1 LEA and 1 school), Barack Obama Green Charter High School (1 LEA and 1 school), Comquest Academy (1 LEA and 1 school), George Gervin Youth Center (1 LEA and 1 school), Higgs Carter King Academy (1 LEA and 1 school), Houston Heights Learning Academy (1 LEA and 1 school), and Shekinah/Radiance Network (2 LEA's and 16 schools).

(3)The applicant provides data indicating that there will be 4,679 participating students from the 24 participating schools; 84.81% of the participating students are from low-income families, based on free or reduced-price lunch exceeding the 40% Race to the Top requirement.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant did not describe the specific process that the applicant used to select the schools to participate.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant generally indicates that the MAP-LS's goals and guidance are based on the reform model from the Texas Title I Priority Schools (TTIPS) research and implementation results. The applicant indicates that the TTIPS Seven (7) Critical

Success Factors (CSP) form the basis for the MAP-LS plan. The applicant indicates that the CSF's support successful MAP-LS implementation is based upon the following three theories of change:

- (1) Focused-Forming - The applicant generally indicates the framework that ensures that students are ready to learn each unit before the unit begins. The teachers will build lesson specific academic vocabulary before the lesson begins by ensuring that every student understands why the lesson is important. The applicant does not specifically describe the plan for focused-learning.
- (2) Project RED - The applicant is very vague in describing how Project RED is a research based implementation model for second-order change to establish the processes and procedures for implementing successful large projects involving technology. The applicant did not explain what the Project RED is or how it will implement projects involving technology.
- (3) Effective and highly effective teachers and leaders - The applicant generally indicates that the plan is an approach to classroom instructional and leadership adjustment that will result in systematically growing effective and highly effective teachers and teachers. The applicant did not describe how the plan will help teachers and leaders to be effective so that student learning outcomes will improve for all students

The applicant generally indicates that EEP's Core Process A ensures that all educators will have clear communication regarding the incentive/payout award and how teachers can earn up to \$8,000 (teachers) and \$12,000 (principals) for improving instruction and student achievement and progress. Core Process B focuses on the implementation of the comprehensive evaluation/observation system. The Core Process C puts in place a professional development system that includes weekly professional development sessions at each campus targeting 100% of educators where a minimum of 50 minutes of weekly Professional Learning Community/Unit meetings. The applicant indicates that the CORE Process D provides career advancement options for effective educators to stay in the classroom by earning a salary supplement when they serve as lead educators, leading unit meetings, observation and supporting teachers, and modeling and demonstrating effective instructional strategies.

The criterion is scored at the medium range because the applicant did not clearly explain its reform proposal or describe reform and change so that the plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who will be served by the applicant.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates goals for improved student outcomes. The applicant describes the vision for the following areas:

- (4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth): The district indicates that 90% of all students will become proficient on all summative assessments by the end of year of each year and having measurable academic growth gains that are at least one standard error above average. The applicant clearly reports that the consortium will increase the number and percentage of students by subgroup in reading, mathematics, social studies, science, ELA, and writing by 10% in Year 1, 15% in Year 2, 20% in Year 3 and 25% in Year 4. (Texas State Assessment STAAR data, TAKS data, end of course data for grades 3 through 11).
- (4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps: The district expects that 90% of the lowest-performing students will make 2.66 years gain. The applicant does not clearly describe how the district will be able to decrease achievement gaps.
- (4)(c) Graduation rates: The applicant expects to graduate no less than 90% of students who are enrolled in LEA's campuses where there is instruction to students enrolled in 7th -12th grade based upon the national definition of dropouts that calculates the graduation rate as the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined in the Race to the Top - District application notice. It is unclear how the applicant's vision will result in improved graduation rates.
- (4)(d) College enrollment: The applicant has a goal in which 90% of their graduating seniors will enroll in college within 16 months of graduating from high school. This goal is ambitious but achievable because part of the MAP-LS plan will make provisions for accelerating instruction for all students. Upon entrance into 9th grade, as part of the required Title I Part A parent compact, every parent and student will be required to sign a commitment to work with the LEA on both the personalized graduation plan and the funding mechanisms to be accepted to and enroll in an institution of higher learning.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because it is unclear how the applicant's ambitious yet achievable annual goals will result in improved student learning, performance, and increased equity or how the goals will result in decreased achievement gaps or increased graduation rates.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)



	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates that the eight (8) LEA's that make up the consortium have had a long history of success when compared to the states in which they are located.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates evidence in the following areas:</p> <p>(1)(a) The George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. demonstrates strong examples of improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. The Houston Heights school consistently scored 70% higher than the state each year and this year earned the title of National Distinguished Title I school. Although the applicant provides data indicating LEA gains vs. State of Texas gains, the applicant did not provide the grade level of the gains or the years that the data of these gains were recorded. The applicant did not provide data for all of the subgroups in the targeted schools.</p> <p>(1)(b) The George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. demonstrates and provides data indicating that in its lowest performing schools, George Gervin Youth Center, Higgs, Carter, King Academy and Radiance Academy implemented three-year comprehensive reform by becoming Accelerated Schools Process (ASP) schools where all stakeholders are involved in the governance process to improve the school. All educators received training in Powerful Learning's (PL) five components and integrates research-based instruction into the classrooms and lessons. Three of the seven LEA's (George Gervin, Radiance Academy and Higgs, Carter, King) are currently implementing this Teacher Incentive Fund3 EEP initiative and all of the remaining five (5) LEA's are ready to join in this Educator Quality reform initiative.</p> <p>(1)(c) The George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. demonstrates evidence of student performance data being made available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The applicant indicates that all summative state student assessment data is provided to parents and students. This initiative will improve the process of training and utilizing data, making the information more understandable, available, and useful to both parents and students.</p> <p>This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant did not provide the data from the subgroups of the targeted school to show improved student learning outcomes and closed achievement gaps. The applicant did not provide the grade levels or the year of the consortium (7 LEA's) gains vs. State of Texas Gains.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium LEA's are all non-profit organizations that are determined by the Internal Revenue Service to be subject to the Open Records Act. All LEA's are charter schools authorized by the state in which they reside and are subject to all the laws and compliance measures outlined in the federal and state codes. The compliance documents include the following: the Texas Education Agency Code, Texas Administrative Code, State Financial Accounting Resource Handbook, the AEIS annual district and campus report cards, the NCLB district and campus report card, Quarterly Solvency Reports, Annual Budgets, Annual Audits, Annual Tax Returns, Board Approved published salary scale, Governance report, required Public Hearings, newsletters, emails, state and school websites, Human Resource Departments, regular post office letters, Educational Service Center, Association of Charter Schools, and the Arizona Board of Education.</p> <p>(a) The applicant indicates that the actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are located in the LEA/s publishes annual audit, published Annual Tax Return, published Annual Board approved Budget, Published Salary Scale, School Governance documents, Human Resources Department, school websites, and annually published school report card AEIS.</p> <p>(b) The district publishes actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff in the Human Resources on personnel action forms, Annual Published School Report Card, published Salary Scale, and on the school websites.</p> <p>(c) The district publishes the actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers in the Human Resources on personnel action forms, Annual School Report Card AEIS, and through the Published Salary Scale, and the budget on the school websites.</p> <p>(d) The district publishes salaries of the actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level in the accounting department on the financial statements published monthly and as needed, Annual School Report Card AEIS, Annual School Budget, School websites, Annual Tax Returns, and reported on the state database.</p> <p>This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant indicates that all LEAs maintain maximum transparency in</p>		

processes, practices, and investments.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant generally indicates that the requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the MAPS-LS Race to the Top - District proposal are outlined in Chapter 12 (Charters) of the Texas Education Code.</p> <p>Although the applicant mentions Chapter 12 of the Texas Education Code, the applicant did not specifically describe the conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. Therefore, this criterion is scored in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes the comprehensive review process that the district completed to determine if it should move forward with the proposed RTT-D application. George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. clearly indicates that the preliminary decision was made by the four (4) primary LEA's (Higgs Carter King Academy - HCK; George Gervin Youth Center - GGYC, Academy of Careers and Technology - ACT, and Radiance Academy - RA). This group made contact with the remaining four LEA's (Houston Heights, Comquest Academy, Shekinah/Radiance, and Barack Obama Green High School) Superintendents. The applicant clearly describes the process of these (8) LEA Superintendents meeting with their teachers and principals and scheduled parent and student meetings to gather input into the design and creation of MAP-LS. The applicant clearly indicates that a survey was conducted among 23 campuses and focus groups were held with teachers and students.</p> <p>(a)(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrates that more than 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal. During the weeks that the MAP-LS Race to the Top - District application was being written, the superintendents shared information related to the surveys, focus groups, and conversations that were held with all stakeholder. The applicant thoroughly indicated that ninety-eight (98%) of all educators approved of the implementation of MAP-LS on their campuses. The applicant included copies of teacher buy-in from in the Appendix which documents the 98% vote to fully support MAP-LS.</p> <p>(b) The applicant thoroughly lists the community stakeholders that agreed to support the project. The first thirty-one (31) key stakeholders included elected officials, community organizations, businesses, colleges, and universities. In addition to these letters, each participating LEA manages from 15 to 30 Memorandum's of Understanding to include Educational Service Centers, non-profits, businesses and trade schools, which includes over an additional 100 opportunities for support of the MAP-LS reform model.</p> <p>The applicant provides clear letters of support from key stakeholders such as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education.</p> <p>This criterion was scored in the high range because the applicant has demonstrated clear evidence of stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and stakeholder support for the proposal.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a high-quality plan for a detailed analysis of the needs and gaps, and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the needs and gaps analysis, in order to create personalized learning environments for every child in the targeted schools. The applicant provides a thorough description of how the Consortium LEA's reviewed each LEA campus data and the improvement plans required of all Title I, Part A schools. This review and analysis resulting in the identification of needs and gaps that were used to design the Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems (MAP-LS) plan for this application.</p> <p>The applicant connected priority needs to the project budgets to ensure that the needed funds would meet the needs. The applicant demonstrates a clear analysis of the following needs/gaps aligned with how the MAP-LS budget addresses the needs/gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for each student to have effective and highly effective educators (Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) - over</li> </ul>		

- \$3.9 million dollars over four years targeted for over 250 teachers, 24 schools, 24 principals, and 8 superintendents
- Need for all schools to scale up their personalized learning support through the identification and use of technology (Personalized Learning Support - Technology) - applications for student/classroom learning - over \$700,000 over a four year period
- Need to provide a wide range of activities and services to students in all age three/grade level cohorts to prepare the youngest students - Cohort #1, #2, and #3 almost \$500,000 over a four year period, including using personalized data systems
- Need for a comprehensive/coherent plan to ensure fidelity of the implementation of MAP-LS - MAP-LS staff, management, and support implementation - \$2 million dollars over four years, including data training and support
- Need for educators to have access to high-quality on-site job-embedded professional development - Professional Development (learning focused, Covey, Summer Boot Camps, PD institutes and academies) - over \$700,000 over a four year period targeting all schools, their leadership teams, and their students
- Need to support all students in reading proficiently by the end of 3rd grade - Reading - over \$1.4 million dollars over a four year period to all schools includes cost of materials, books, and an Action 100 coach
- Need for personalized instruction in math - Math - over \$260,000 each year for four years for all schools
- Need to have multiple training and support opportunities and activities for all parents - Parent Advancement Program - over \$285,000 over a four year period for all schools, students, and parents.

This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant demonstrates a thorough analysis of the needs and gaps in the targeted schools with evidence of a high-quality plan to implement personalized learning environments.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

### (C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., describes a very general plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

(a)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v) The applicant describes a very general plan for students to understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant indicates that the plan will allow for students to Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college-ready curriculum, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals. However, the applicant did not provide the details or the clarity on how the students will gain this understanding. The applicant generally indicates that students will be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. However, the applicant did not provide the details on how students will be involved in learning experiences in areas of their academic interest. The applicant did not describe a clear plan for students to have access and exposure to contexts and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. The applicant did not describe a clear plan for students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting and critical thinking. The applicant describes Objective A: All students will understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals, and to identify and pursue learning and development of goals linked to college- and career-ready standards. The applicant aligns this objective, activities, action steps, person responsible, timeline for completion, and evidence of impact. However, the details of the activities, action steps, and evidence of impact are not clearly described in order to provide high-quality instructional approaches and environments.

(b)(i)(ii)(iii) The applicant generally indicates that each student will have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and to ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. The applicant did not describe high-quality instructional approaches and environments. The applicant generally indicates that a digital learning content inventory will be conducted, but the applicant did not describe high-content digital learning content aligned with college-and career-ready standards.

(b)(iv)(A) The applicant did not describe or provide the details of plans to frequently update individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(b)(iv)(B) The applicant did not describe or provide the details of plans for students to receive personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(b)(v) The applicant describes a general plan to provide accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The applicant briefly describes the high-quality accelerated instruction, that will be provided to all of the special needs students and ELL students, that includes before-the-lesson vocabulary instruction that will prepare students in advance so that they can focus on the lesson with an understanding of the vocabulary terms. The applicant also describes a critical success factor that focuses on increased learning time to ensure that high-need students will have access to additional instructional time.

(c) The applicant did not specifically describe mechanisms that are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant generally indicates that the focus on educator training and preparedness will be the main mechanism that will be used to provide superior training and support to all students. Teachers will be given the training and professional development to be able to use the tools and resources to train students. Although the applicant generally describes the teacher training, the applicant does not describe how the mechanisms will be in place to that students will understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

Overall, the applicant provides a very general plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant provides the goals in the narrative and in the objectives and the timeline of the objectives, but the activities, strategies, and the means to reach the measurable objectives have not been clearly developed to reach the objective. It is unclear if this learning plan will improve learning and teaching or if personalizing the learning environment will provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a plan to implement the Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP). The applicant clearly indicates that EEP is a United States Department of Education (USDE) Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) project that has been successful during the past years of implementation in ten (10) Texas charter school organizations. Each LEA is committed to implementing EEP's four (4) core processes. The applicant indicates that six of the 24 targeted campuses are currently in various stages of implementing EEP and the other 18 campuses will join in the training and the implementation of EEP.

(a)(i) The applicant generally indicates that Core Process C will provide professional development sessions at each campus targeted at 100% of the educators with the focus on a minimum of 50 minutes of weekly Professional Learning Community/Unit meeting times where educators work together lead by a teacher leader to learn and implement the rubric. However, the applicant did not describe clear strategies that will be utilized to meet each student's academic needs and to help ensure that all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

(a)(ii) The applicant indicates that participating educators will adapt content and instruction, provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs and academic interests. The applicant clearly describes the training of all teachers in the Accelerated Schools' Process called Powerful Learning. Teachers will learn how to make instruction more powerful using the five components of powerful learning (authentic learning, continuous learning, interactive learning, learner-centered learning, and inclusive learning). This focus on making instruction more powerful will make learning authentic so that students are engaged in deep learning experiences that interest them. Students will also make connections to prior learning which will help students to gain deeper learning.

(a)(iii) It is quite clear that professional development opportunities will allow teachers to come together as teams and to review the learning expectations map in order to select the most effective methods of assessment. The applicant indicates that educators will utilize training and support from Learning-Focused Professional Developers to learn to develop formative assessments to guide instruction and to assess learning during lessons, integrate writing benchmark assessments to ensure grade level expectations are being met, and connect instruction to assessments by analyzing prompts in order to increase rigor, vigor and deepen student thinking.

(a)(iv) The applicant will consider both professional practices as well as student performance data when evaluating teachers. The applicant describes Core Process B that focuses on how educators become more effective through the implementation of the comprehensive evaluation/observation system where teachers and principals receive pre and post-observation conferences each year. Using the data from TEDS (Teacher Evaluation Data System), educators will provide professional development supporting teachers in becoming effective and highly effective educators. Core Process D provides career advancement options for effective and highly effective educators to earn a salary supplement when serving as lead educators, leading unit meetings, supporting teachers, and modeling and demonstrating effective strategies. The Core Processes demonstrate EEP's ability to reward educator effectiveness, retain effective educators, and improve student academic performances.

(b)(i)(ii) The applicant describes how all participating educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The applicant clearly indicates that each state (Texas, Arizona, and New Jersey) has adopted mandatory standards that each school is required to use to guide instruction for all Pre-Kinder through 12 grade students as well as college- and career-ready standards. These standards will serve as the basis for MAP-LS plan to prepare students to be ready to graduate on time and ready to compete in the global society, college- and career-ready. The applicant describes online, software instructional programs that will be used by the 24 schools. These online programs will have formative assessment information provided to the students as they solve problems and utilize online personalized curriculum resources.

(b)(iii) The applicant describes the processes and tools that will be utilized to match student needs with specific resources and approaches. The MAP-LS plan for preparing students for college and careers includes the following three (3) approaches to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that will support participating students by providing personalized individual instruction: Learning Focused model, Texas Title I Priority school model, and Project Red.

(c)(i)(ii) The applicant describes the process in which all participating school leaders and school leadership teams will have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that will enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs. Each of the campuses in the consortium will have their own Leadership Team. The applicant indicates that leadership effectiveness will be increased through on-going job embedded professional development. The initiative will develop models for distributed leadership, and protocols for leading grade-level learning teams that will be developed and implemented across the entire district PLCs. The sustainability of grade-level teams and across district teams through PLC's depends on the coherence with district policies and practices that the initiative's districts will develop, maintain and monitor.

(d) The process of providing a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals is adequately defined. The Educator Effectiveness Process (EEP) will ensure that all participating schools will have access to this process that will train and prepare staff through a comprehensive performance based system that rewards and recognizes effective educators for improving student performance and a comprehensive observation/evaluation system that focuses on the implementation of a personalized system that has standards for all educators. This process relates to a clear plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective teachers and principals.

This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. However, the applicant did not describe clear strategies that will be utilized to meet each student's academic needs and to help ensure that all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. has described an unclear plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure.

(a) The applicant describes how the LEA/Consortium office will be organized for the proposed project. The applicant indicates that each primary LEA's Superintendent will provide specific support and services to the participating schools. The CEO and Superintendent of George Gervin Academy, will be the lead/fiscal agent for this initiative. The following four individuals will constitute the governance entity/Executive Committee that will lead the Consortium: CEO and Superintendent of George Gervin Academy; CEO and the Superintendent of Academy of Academy of Careers and Technology; CEO and Superintendent of the Shekinah and Radiance Academies; and CEO and Superintendent of the Higgs, Carter, King Gifted and Talented Charter Academy. The staff will include Dr. Margie Jorgensen, MAP-LS Commissioner, who will oversee 100% of the activities, day-to-day duties and tasks of five (5) expert-level master educators in leading MAP-LS. The five (5) expert-level master educators will be responsible for providing support, training, oversight management, and professional development to five schools each for a total of 25 schools.

(b) The applicant demonstrates a very generalized understanding of providing school leadership teams in the participating schools. The applicant indicates that each of the campuses in the consortium has their own autonomous Leadership Team with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over school schedules and calendars, personnel, staffing, roles and responsibilities, and budget. The applicant indicates that the Commissioner will oversee all MAP-LS activities, tasks, and responsibilities and will answer to the four primary LEA;s. The applicant indicates that the Commissioner will be responsible for the communication with the consortium's Executive Committee on all matters

requiring approval for changes. The applicant indicates that the Commissioner will be in charge of planning, scheduling, and presenting the TTIPS' seven Critical Success Factors (CSF) training to all LEA's and staff. However, this seems as if it is a huge task for one individual to be in charge of all of this training for all LEA's and staff.

(c) The applicant generally indicates that students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based demonstrated mastery through credit by exam. The applicant generally indicates that the Commissioner will work with each LEA to ensure that appropriate staff receive training that will create systems that allow students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner will work closely with all LEA's, there is not a plan presented on how all consortium members will collaborate to have the same policies in place within their schools.

(d) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is charged with making sure LEA's provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, the applicant did not provide any description on how this will occur.

(e) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is charged with making sure that LEA's provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners, the applicant did not provide any description on how this will occur.

This criterion was scored in the medium range because the applicant describes a governance structure, but it did not describe a plan to have practices, policies, and rules in place to provide support for each educator and student.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., has provided an unclear plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure to provide every student and educator with the support and resources that they need.

(a) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is responsible for ensuring that each LEA provide access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to all participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders as appropriate and relevant to student learning to support the full implementation of this MAP-LS proposal, the applicant did not describe a plan on how this will occur.

(b) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is responsible for ensuring that the LEA's students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, through a variety of strategies including the possibilities of peer support, online support or campus-based, local support as designed in this application, the applicant did not describe a plan on how this will occur.

(c) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is responsible for ensuring the use of information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems including electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records, the applicant did not describe a plan on how this will occur.

(d) Although the applicant indicates that the Commissioner is responsible for ensuring that all LEA's and schools use interoperable data systems to collect and communicate information to inform decision making at every level with students, parents and educators, the applicant did not describe a plan on how this will occur.

The applicant describes the critical role of project management, evaluation, and support by Wexford, Inc. The Wexford Institute, one of the four divisions of Wexford, will be the R, E & M (Research, Evaluation & Management) agency for the proposed project.

This criterion is scored in the low range because the applicant did not provide a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., generally describes their overall management process, a Total Quality Management (TQM) approach, which is linked closely with the American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) initiative. The applicant indicates that it will utilize this approach to incorporate the use of evaluation data into project realignment, utilizing a continuous improvement process, as well as entering and analyzing information into the evaluation process, so that improvements can be made. This continuous improvement process will be used to evaluate management structure and effectiveness; the degree to which the project meets all goals and objectives, district satisfaction, and perception of and effectiveness of services; and outcomes related to the models of supportive pay for teachers and principals.</p> <p>The applicant generally describes the following data collection measures that will be used: descriptive data (to describe the interventions and activities that are conducted, and who is participating in them); quality analysis data (to determine the quality of each intervention, activity, resource and service); implementation analysis data (to determine how implemented and the degree of implementation); outcome analysis data (to determine project outcomes, including those related to Performance Measures); and return on investment analysis data (to determine the cost benefit of various components of the project).</p> <p>The applicant generally demonstrates the process of continuous improvement management-evaluation process that will occur during data collection and analysis through monthly meetings, conference calls, quarterly reports and meetings, and through social media outlets using handheld devices. The project management will work closely with direct administration to inform best practices in the LEAs to make systemic and sustainable adjustments.</p> <p>Although the applicant provides a general process for continuous improvement, the applicant did not specifically address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top - District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff. Therefore, this criterion is scored in the medium range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., demonstrates that the initiative will use a structured engagement management model (aligned with TQM) in its ongoing communication and engagement plan. The applicant also clearly indicates that the initiative will develop a strategic communications plan that is already being drafted by various partners of the MAPS-LS Alliance. The consortium gathered and analyzed all of the communications the targeted districts currently use, which included print, face-to-face, digital communications, and social media platforms.</p> <p>The applicant indicates that communication will include district partners, community stakeholders, teachers, parents, local businesses, employees, and companies that support the Alliance.</p> <p>The district thoroughly describes sixteen (16) goals of the Alliance Communication Plan. These goals will be analyzed continuously and adjusted as needed. Data analysis will be conducted on all aspects of the the communication plan and will guide the program.</p> <p>This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant describes thorough ongoing communication and engagement throughout the application.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., clearly describes performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The applicant has posted the student performance measures that are going to be used to monitor the success in the project. The applicant provides a clear alignment of each measure with college and career level mastery.</p> <p>The performance measures that will measure progress toward college- and career-level mastery include the following assessments: Battell Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2); Texas College and Career Readiness Standards for Elementary Schools; ACT-Explore; and PSAT.</p>		

For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant did not describe:

- (a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;
- (b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and
- (c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

All Population (Required Performance Measures): The applicant did not provide the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup of:

- a. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup whose teacher of record and principal are a highly effective teacher and a highly effective principal); and
- b. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are an effective teacher and an effective principal.

The applicant provides performance measures (Prek-3 a.b.; 4-8 a.b.c.; 9-12 a.b.c.d.e.), overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The applicant provides baseline data, with ambitious, yet achievable increases during each of the four (4) years of the grant, including the increases for the Year 2016-2017 (Post grant).

Although the applicant has developed ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall, with annual targets, the applicant did not answer the three (3) questions describing the applicant-proposed measures. Therefore, this criterion is scored in the medium range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., describes a general plan to evaluate the Race to the Top - District program. The design focuses on four types of evaluation: (1) Descriptive evaluation (what services have been provided; who has participated in what services); (2) Formative evaluation (data from online data systems for surveys, observations, and teacher and student information); (3) Evaluation for administrators and teachers (quality of services; changes needed in classroom practices and leadership practices; quality of professional development and how closely aligned to teacher and principal effectiveness measures); and (4) Summative evaluation of outcomes and effects (intended and unintended student, teacher, and administrator outcomes, school outcomes, system outcomes, and lessons learned; outcomes are linked to which individual project services); has the project improved student achievement across all student populations; has the project decreased the dropout rate; has the project implemented and supported a college-career going environment; what is the impact of the professional development and how should the model be adjusted; is there a relationship between certain principal and teacher effectiveness measures, characteristics, or behaviors, and student achievement?

The applicant indicates that it will use quantitative and qualitative data to address the project goals, objectives and performance. The applicant provides a list of qualitative measures that will be used, but did not identify the quantitative measures that will be used to evaluate the program.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant provides a plan on whom will do the evaluation, but the applicant did not provide information on the quantitative measures that will be used to evaluate the program and how they will verify effectiveness of the Race to the Top - District funded activities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., did not provide a detailed budget narrative, but the tables identify all funds that will support the project. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and the implementation of the applicant's proposal.

The applicant did not provide the rationale for the investments and priorities, including a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal. The applicant did not describe the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period.

The applicant demonstrates a very thorough description of all the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal in the following Race to the Top - District electronic budget spreadsheets:

1. Overall Budget Summary

a. Subpart 1: Overall Budget Summary Table

b. Subpart 2: Overall Budget Summary Narrative

2. Project-Level Detail

a. Subpart 3: Project-Level Budget Summary Tables

b. Subpart 4: Project-Level Budget Narratives

The applicant is requesting the following Race to the Top-District grant funds: Year 1 (\$3,107,743.60); Year 2 (\$2,905,632.05); Year 3 (\$2,049,658.43); Year 4 (\$1,921,221.48), for a total of \$9,984,255.55.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant was very detailed in the budget tables, but the applicant did not provide a thorough budget narrative clearly describing all of the line items.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, John Gervin Youth Center, Inc., generally describes the sustainability of Goal 1 and Goal 3 after the term of the grant.

The applicant aligns each goal, objective, measurement/effectiveness data, and deliverables/timeline/responsible party, but does not align the sustainability of each goal after the term of the grant.

The applicant lists the following sustainability factors of the project's goals:

Goal 1 - Dual Credit program becomes institutionalized all participating schools; core curriculum will be developed during Years 2, 3, 4; transition curriculum between the 8th and 9th grade is developed during Years 1, 2, 3, 4

Goal 3 - A plan for securing and retaining high quality AP teachers is in place; student mentors are in place to support student achievement on the national Career Readiness test; supports are put in place to support student achievement on the Gallup Student Poll.

This criterion is scored in the low range because the applicant did not provide the details for sustainability of all of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., demonstrates a strong explanation of the partnerships and how they will help

to expand opportunities for participating students.

(1) The applicant provides a clear description of the partnership that it has formed with organizations to build an extensive school to career component of this project . The applicant clearly indicates that there are over 130 third-party relationships to support this program from a variety of community-based entities. The applicant indicates that most of these relationships have existed ten to twenty years. The applicant also notes that ninety-percent of MAP-LS participating LEA's were non-profit service providers prior to becoming charter schools. The applicant also identifies relationships for this project with colleges and universities. An exciting relationship, described by the applicant, is the partnership with the National Basketball Association Retired Players Association, which includes the retired women's teams, and the Globetrotters. These individuals have agreed to serve as mentors, coaches, trainers, and role models.

(2) The applicant identifies nine (9) population-level desired results for students in the targeted schools that align with and support the applicant's Race to the Top-District proposal. The applicant lists the following population-level results: connecting high need youth and families; strengthen student and family assistance programs; provide crisis assistance and prevention; provide support for transitions; encourage home involvement in schooling; expand community outreach for involvement; address classroom focused enabling; decrease the school dropout rate and increase attendance; and build a stronger interest in technical careers.

(3) The applicant clearly describes how the partnership will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA or consortium and at the student level for the participating students. The consortium will track all selected indicators that measure each result for each student and compiled in a database that is accessible to all stakeholders. The applicant has established measurable benchmarks for each of the population-level indicators.

The applicant describes how the project will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty, family instability, or other child welfare issues. Student enrollment data and program classification will be used to determine specific needs of students facing significant challenges. Each student that is in this category will be given an Individualized Educational Plan with short and long-term benchmarks.

The applicant clearly describes how the district will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities in the LEA or consortium over time. The MAPS-LS will create School-site Resource Coordinating Teams and Multi-site Resource Coordinating Councils that will enhance the coordination of services and programs.

(4) The applicant clearly describes how the partnership will integrate education and other services for participating students. The applicant will match expectations with sufficient resources; provide sufficient resources; make provisions for input from community stakeholders; support local capacity and communication; and support ongoing evaluation and continuous program improvement.

(5) The district describes how the partnership will build the capacity of staff in participating schools.

- The applicant clearly describes how the district will assess the needs and assets of participating students by working with local college and universities to recruit mental health and social service professionals, as well as contract with experienced professionals.
- The applicant clearly indicates that the district will identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community, that are aligned with the goals for improving the education and family and community supports. The applicant plans to align the overall MAPS-LS project goals, objectives and performance measures with the social emotional performance measures of each student. When this is completed, the School-site Resource Coordinating Team will provide professional development to all LEA staff.
- The applicant thoroughly describes the decision-making process and infrastructure used to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students. The School-site Resource Coordinating Teams and Multisite Resource Coordinating Councils will enhance the coordination and integration of services and programs.
- The district has clearly defined how it will be engaging every parent and family in the monitoring and planning of educational and career opportunities of every students. Parents will be involved with the School-site Resource Coordinating Teams and the Multisite Resource Coordinating Council. Parents will also be involved in the development of their child's individual comprehensive plans that includes academics as well as social/emotional health.
- The applicant indicates that the progress in implementing its plan will be assessed to maximize the impact and to make changes when there are challenges or problems. The applicant generally indicates that the project evaluation will support the monitoring of the progress of the plan.

(6) The applicant generally indicates that it will identify annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describes the desired results for students. The applicant did not provide a plan on how they will achieve the following performance measures for the proposed population-level groups. The applicant aligns the student population to the assessment and/or targeted result:

- Promote early childhood social and emotional development for 100% of our students
- Develop initiatives to increase understanding of 100% of the staff and families of social and emotional development

- Integrate social and emotional development into existing programs and services
- Prevent social, emotional, and behavioral health disorders in 100% of our students
- Identify very young children at risk of social, emotional and behavioral health programs and enable provider to deliver effective interventions
- Require quality school standards in all 100% of our schools
- Connect the specialized needs of children with appropriate services

The George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. has described a clear description of the sustainable partnership that it has formed with public organizations. However, the applicant did not provide a plan on how they will achieve the performance measures for the proposed population-level groups. Therefore, this Competitive Preference Priority is scored in the high range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., addresses how it will build on the four core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching.

1. The applicant provides general information on how the district will adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy. The district will establish common language among all targeted schools around the issue of standards and assessments. The applicant will train all schools- leadership teams on the type of assessments and the use of the assessment data to inform all levels of instruction for all students.
2. The applicant generally indicates that the district will build data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction. The applicant generally indicates that the project will train all schools on the use of interoperable data.
3. The applicant demonstrates how the district will recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. The applicant indicates that 20 targeted schools will receive the requisite training and support to implement with fidelity the teacher and principal Educator Effective Process (EEP). The applicant plans to have a Superintendent Evaluation System in operation no later than 2015.
4. The applicant generally indicates that it will turn around the lowest-achieving schools. The applicant indicates that seven (7) of the 24 schools are in various stages of transformation with school improvement initiatives.

The applicant provides information indicating that the Personalized Learning Consortium will support comprehensive reform. It will guarantee each participating Pre-Kinder-12th grade student Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning Systems (MAP-LS) so that they are prepared to graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The applicant indicates that the MAP-LS is the LEA-wide reform and change plan that will ensure that all students in the participating schools reach the outcome goals. The applicant indicates that the MAP-LS's goals and guidance are aligned with the State of Texas' model for transformation based upon the Texas Title I Priority Schools (TTIPS) research and implementation results.

The applicant clearly demonstrates personalized learning systems by aligning age and grade level cohorts, data systems, timelines, user, purpose and outcome.

Therefore, the applicant, George Gervin Youth Center, Inc., has met Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning.

Total	210	134
-------	-----	-----

## Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	2

### Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes an Optional Budget Supplement line item budget for Community Partnerships.

The total budget requested is as follows: Year 1 (\$500,000); Year 2 (\$500,000); Year 3 (\$500,000); Year 4 (\$500,000); for a total of \$2,000,000.

The applicant generally estimates that for approximately 4,500 students and their families to participate in the Community Partnerships Program, the cost will average about \$425 per student. This cost will cover fees, tutors, mentors, membership, travel, field trips, programming supplies and materials, community outreach personnel, staff liaisons, etc.

The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan for how the applicant would carry out the activities for the Community Partnerships. Therefore, two (2) points were awarded for the Optional Budget Supplement.



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1326TX-3 for George Gervin Youth Center, Inc.

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. vision states that it is a collective and collaborative work from all 24 schools that are part of the application. The Center states the four core educational assurance areas and ensures their plan and vision includes each one.

- The plan is lacking strong vision for a clear and credible approach for adopting standards and assessments according to the core educational assurance area, it simply stated that establishing common language of assessment, training school leadership teams, and ensuring all assessment activities are for the purpose of preparing students to be college and career ready. More explanations and reasoning are needed to fully understand this portion of the application.
- Presents a strong plan for the purpose of building a data system that all stakeholders can have easy and instant access and ownership to, however it was unclear what exactly "data notebooks" are and how they will help to transform the vision.
- The Center provided insufficient details about the connection between the Educator Effective Process and Superintendent Evaluation system and how to it will recruit, develop, reward, and retain those positions where they are needed most.
- The Center did include that 7 of the 24 schools have already started this reform plan and are experiencing significant progress. The Vision does not specifically say what the progress has been.
- Reform vision did not include how to reach such goals as accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.

Overall, the Center lacks specific details on how the four core educational assurance areas will be achieved. The Center plans to use MAP-LS (Maximized Accelerated Personalized Learning System) for every student pre-k-12, but fails to describe what exactly the system is or how it is a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. Therefore, this places George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. at the top of the medium range of points.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin Youth Center, Inc. has already selected and identified the schools (pre-k through 12) that will be part of this grant. It is ambitious that 4 of the 27 schools initiated the reform and the remaining 23 schools asked to be part of the proposed reform. The Center clearly states that all 27 schools listed meet the competition's eligibility requirements that will impact 4,679 students. It is important to note that 84.81% of the participating students are from low-income families. 272 educators will take part in this grant as well as 3104 students who are classified as high-need.

Based on the numbers provided, it is clear that George Gervin Youth Center, Inc will be teaching a vast majority of high-need and low-income students that would greatly benefit from the reform proposed. Therefore, this places the Center at the top of the high range.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin is confident in their plan to reform for all of their participating schools. Their high quality plan includes 3 main theories of change (Focused Learning, Project RED, and reformed classroom walkthroughs) that are convincing for other districts and schools to adopt.

George Gervin has thoroughly described how their proposal will be scaled up beyond their LEA to showcase their processes, procedures, adjustments and effects of student learning and growth to be as transparent as possible for replication:

- George Gervin Academy Race to the Top Website
- Quarterly Free webinars, PowerPoints then posted to website
- 4 on-site day-long seminars for educators
- Published white papers

By using the reform plan presented (MAP-LS), it is convincing that the Academy hopes to retain and reward it's most effective teachers so that they will stay in the classroom to positively effect student progress.

Overall, the Academy has presented feasible and strong ideas for their plan to be replicated in other districts as well as rewarding effective teachers. This places George Gervin in the top of the high range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin documents baseline data for all categories (a-d) and provides ambitious yet achievable goal data for each. The LEA's desire to set high expectations for all students is clear and evident by implementing the proposed MAP-LS. The plan states that 90% of all students will become proficient or above average on all summative assessments by the end of year 1. George Gervin is in good shape to reach the high standards due to the evidence provided such as:

- Outpacing the state in the % of improvement (State- 7%, George Gervin- 20%)
- Implementation of ARC's 100 Responses to Intervention program to decrease the achievement gap
- High expectations (90%) for graduate rate with one school already going from 29% to 0 for dropout rate.
- Incorporating a strong parent compact that will require a parent and student commitment to attend a program of higher learning after high school graduation. 90% college enrollment is very ambitious.

Overall, it is clear that George Gervin presents a strong vision and has already made progress in improving student learning. The MAP-LS personalized learning plan is very detailed to include a variety of resources, assessments, and data to ensure improvement and documentation of learning from birth to 12th grade. Therefore, this places George Gerin at the top of the high range of points.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) George Gervin has a handful of nationally recognized schools for attendance, social studies, gains in math/reading, etc. The data presented clearly shows that while the State of Texas had gains at about 29%, the George Gervin schools matched or exceeded the State for almost every sub group of students. This shows convincing evidence of improving student learning outcomes and closing the achievement gaps.</p> <p>However, George Gervin failed to include high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates in this section.</p> <p>(b) George Gervin gives vague detail about achieving ambitious and significant reform at its low-performing schools with no data to back up the statements found in (b). It states that 3 local charter schools achieved AYP status after not doing so for more than 3 years; AYP status was achieved based on the implementation of of the Accelerated Schools Process- which is part of the proposed RTT-D plan. More evidence is needed to support a clear track record of success.</p> <p>(c) George Gervin states that student assessment data is provided to the parents and students, but fails to explain how this is done. There is no clear track record stated on how the information is provided to students, parents, and educator in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services currently.</p> <p>Overall, George Gervin is clear that they have convincing reform and ideas to have students take ownership of their assessment data in the future, but fails to show current/past success in making this happen. Also, the subgroups aren't clear. Several key pieces of data and evidence are missing from (a) and (b) and therefore this results in George Gervin earning in the middle of the medium range of points.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is extremely clear that George Gervin is transparent in many ways for all salaries and expenditures. Actual salaries and expenditures for (a), (b), (c), and (d) can be found/made public by a variety of resources including published audits, annual tax returns, school websites, published school report card, and many State and Texas and Federal reports listed in the application. This demonstrates George Gervin already makes this information available which would indicate future funds would be equally as transparent if awarded. Therefore, this places George Gervin at the top of the high range of points.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>George Gervin indicates that their MAPS-LS application proposal has successful conditions under State requirements as outlined in the Chapter 12 of the Texas Education Code. George Gervin has already demonstrated this autonomy with the implementation of the EEP and PBCS programs.</p> <p>Therefore, George Gervin will receive full points due to the district having the autonomy and conditions to do personalized learning environments and will not face any legal roadblock when it moves forward to implement each component of the RTT-D grant.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>George Gervin clearly has all stakeholders in favor and and supporting the RTT-D proposed plan.</p> <p>(a) Initiated by 4 of the 8 LEA's, George Gervin was able to successfully gather support for all 8 LEA's. Teachers, Principals, students, parents were given the opportunity to be part of the planning meetings, surveys, and focus groups. However, George Gavin doesn't specifically say how the teachers/students/parents were selected for these initial planning events or if every teacher/student/parent had the option to participate. George Gervin states that revisions were made to the plan at the weekly superintendent meetings based on information gathered from the surveys, focus groups and conversations. With 98% of the educators pledging support of the application, it is extremely clear that the educators involved are ready for reform.</p> <p>(b) The letters of support provides additional evidence that a wide variety of stakeholders support the proposal. Mayors, City Representatives, community businesses, students, parents, and higher learning institutes, non-profits, etc all have submitted letters of support for George Gervin.</p>		

Overall, it is reasonable to conclude that the 8 LEA's all have internal and external stakeholders that have pledged their support to the RTT-D plan. Ensuring that every student and parent had initial buy-in (or the opportunity to do so) would have made this a stronger application. Therefore, George Gervin will receive points at the top of the high range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin has developed a very detailed plan for reform based on the review of each LEA's campus data and improvement plan as required for all Title 1, Part A Schools. The logic behind each part of the 8 sections of reform was convincing and reasonable.

George Gervin stated that the needs and gaps were gathered by the Consortium LEAs, which shows ownership of current data and results and convincing determination to keep improving.

Some evidence is included about the current status of implementing personalized learning environments such as "TIF" being implemented successfully at 10 of the schools to improve student access to an effective teachers. More evidence showing current status of implementation of personalized learning environments would have made this a stronger application.

Evidence for the logic behind the reform proposed included many needs such as:

- Research behind and implementation of Project Red
- A greater STEM and Reading focus for all 3 cohort aged groups
- Access to high-quality professional development

Overall, George Gavin's plan for future reform is excellent. Many excellent needs were identified, but only 1 gap was specifically identified (Math proficiencies). More gaps based on current data would have made this a stronger application. Therefore, this places George Gervin in the middle of the medium range of points.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) George Gervin presents high quality ideas on how to ensure students that their education is aligned with their goals by ensuring every campus (educators, students, and parents) is trained on "Covey's 7 Habits of Effective People/Leader In Me" and the personalized daily data folders. Both of these plans as well as access to AP courses and dual credit course offerings ensures students are connecting curriculum to college and career ready expectations.</p> <p>The plan lacks details in being involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. George Gervin states they will use "Powerful Learning" which is justified for the deep learning experience, but not enough evidence is included to clearly demonstrate that the deep learning experiences will be of the student's actual academic interest.</p> <p>Online instructional resources will provide for increased access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives, but the plan does not clearly state how the curriculum will motivate and deepen individual student learning--- just that it will by including job-embedded meetings for the teachers.</p> <p>(a) (v) is missing completely from the application, as well as many areas (besides (a)(i) exclude parental involvement.</p> <p>(b) Professional development for the George Gervin teachers is a strong component of this application. With ambitious and sounds professional development, it is evident that the personalized learning goals for each student will be able to be successfully developed. The plan includes the concept for focused and researched based instructional approaches, methods, and activities to accelerate student learning, but fails to clearly present these approaches. High quality content for college and career ready will come from Project Red initiative and other online curriculum resources which are sound ways to ensure these standards.</p> <p>George Gervin student data will be able to be accessed and updated daily along with training on understanding the data for all students which demonstrates a solid evidence in regular and ongoing feedback. The plan accounts for educators being able to receive training on how to properly communicate with parents on the actual level of their child. However, this plan doesn't include how often this will happen which is necessary to document how ongoing and frequent this will occur.</p>		

George Gervin will switch from remediation to more of a high-quality accelerated instruction model to help ensure high-need students are caught up to and on pace to being career and college ready. They also state that these students will have access to additional instructional time, enrichment activities, and that teachers have additional planning time to accommodate this, but there are no clear evidence on how this will be executed.

(c) George Gervin is clear that the students will have superior support to understand how to use the tools and resources by way of the highly trained educators. While having educators spend 6-8 weeks of their summer submersed in professional development is ambitious, it is certainly not achievable or desirable. Teachers need time to reflect and recharge in order to successfully teach from their heart at full force throughout the school year. 6-8 weeks of professional development over the summer is not reasonable.

Overall, while George Gervin contains excellent ideas to increase student learning, the plan lack specific detail in many areas on how this will actually be supported completely or is simply unreasonable given the current conditions. Therefore, this places George Gervins in the middle of the medium range of points.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) All educators will be part of a professional learning/development group based on needs identified in observations. Benchmark assessments will be given every 3 weeks which demonstrates frequent measuring of student progress. This professional development will be part of creating individualized learning goals for each student. George Gervin will adopt Common Core Standards and a variety of state standards that demonstrate appropriate standards for college and career readiness. It is extremely clear that feedback from the reformed evaluation system will drive practices and effectiveness for George Gervin.

(b) Actionable information will be gathered and assessed from the student's "Data Notebooks" that everyone will have training and access to. The data is a good example of how to respond to individual needs and interest. High quality resources are stated as reformed assessments for every grade level to show achievement based on student's individual needs. George Gervin presents solid evidence showing a wide variety of different assessments that will be given to ensure college and career ready standards are met. Each assessment in the plan will be able to demonstrate if more mastery is achieved yet.

(c) George Gervin's evaluation reform for all schools includes a highly successful Educator Effectiveness Process. This evaluation system shows strong evidence that the gathered information will help to improve educator effectiveness and continuous school improvement. Such evidence includes items such as:

- financially rewarding teachers that are able to improve student performances
- Weekly professional development in PLC's that are based on needs identified from the thorough observation system that are research based

(d) George Gervin indicates they will use an Educator Effectiveness Process to ensure students have effective teachers and principals. This is a strong example on how to financially reward teachers for continuing excellent classroom teaching as well as lead other teachers to a higher standard. There is no mention in the plan how this will specifically increase the amount of effective teachers at hard to staff schools, subjects or specialty areas.

Overall, this part of the application was confusing in some part as some of the areas were not fully addressed. George Gervin included 2 excellent activities that they plan to do to incorporate the parents to help transfer education value, as well as mentioning the use of Covey "Leader in Me" curriculum- but failed to indicate how they specifically fit this part of the application. While George Gavin presents some excellent idea, the application is sparse and confusing in different sections which leads to doubt that this is an achievable and ambitious plan. Therefore, George Gervin will earn in the high of the medium range of points.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) George Gervin has included a strong plan for the consortium governance structure as evident in:

- All LEA's have signed a MOU that will hold all accountable the length of the grant

- implementation of the initiative will require an unanimous vote by the 4 Executive Committee members.
- Justification on the selection of the 4 Executive Committee members is clear, as they are more established schools serving as model and demonstration schools for the 4 remaining LEAs.
- Under the direction of the MAP-LS Commissioner, all LEA's will be supported by 1 of the 5 expert-level master educators.

(b) George Gervin clearly states that the participating schools will have control of these factors. The Commissioner will charge of every area concerning training.

(c) George Gervin states that the LEA's will be trained and presented with options for course completion, but no clear plan is described. This is an area of weakness for George Gervin.

(d) Again, George Gervin states they will give students many opportunities to demonstrate mastery, but this is lacking convincing and comprehensive plan to support this statement.

(e) A variety of learning resources and instructional practices will be available to all George Gervin students as outlined in the application. The focus on online learning and acceleration is a justified method of varied and accelerated instruction including students with disabilities and English learners. George Gervin doesn't specifically list and explain these resources and practices- but stated that part A, B, and C clearly spells these ideas out.

George Gervin will receive in the middle of the medium range of points. Their strength is the consortium governance structure but they are missing key components for c and d.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin is lacking clear and extensive evidence to prove that the plan is of high level and that everyone involved will have the resources and supplies necessary in the following areas:

(a), (b), (c), Simply stating that the Commissioner in charge is responsible for this area does not prove a high quality plan is executable. More extensive details on **how** the Commissioner will ensure that all parents, students, and educators have the necessary learning tools in and out of school, appropriate technical support, utilizing comprehensive data systems would make this a stronger application.

However,

(d) The 8 interoperable data systems proposed are very convincing that they will work together for the complete package of a thorough data system. The George Gervin commissioner will be responsible for ensuring this with the support of Wexford Inc. The inclusion of Wexford Inc. provides in depth data-based research and knowledge.

Overall, George Gervin's plan for the use of interoperable data system is extremely convincing, but the application fails to fully document how the commissioner will ensure responsibility for this area results in earning at the bottom of the middle range of points.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin has established a strong plan for a continuous learning process.

- Establishment of all educators becoming part of PLC (per grade level at schools and throughout the district) is an excellent way to ensure reflection on current learning and offers the ability to plan for ongoing corrections and

improvements.

- Monthly meetings, conference calls, social media, and quarterly reports are all solid ways in communicating feedback to the staff assigned to the project.
- Showing student ownership of progress is documented with the use of a data notebook and accurate student dashboard. These are excellent ways to include students in the learning cycle.

However,

More concrete methods of communicating the quality of the investment to the public need to be included for a stronger application. Also, there is no specific documentation noting ongoing corrections and improvement after the the grant.

Overall, this places George Gervin at the bottom of the high range due to having a solid improvement plan, it just needs a stronger method of publicly sharing the information during and after the grant.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin has included a wide range of ongoing communication strategies like surveys, social media, and community and school presentations. Acknowledgement that face to face and small group communication plays a significant role is a very positive strategy.

The application states some plans without specifically stating **how** they plan to implement:

- Increase teacher and staff awareness to the initiative
- Communicate graduation plans and data
- Communicate plan to students and parents

These vague statements do not show solid evidence in plans, although George Gavin does include some steps to successful communication with all stakeholders. Therefore, this places them at the top of the middle range of points.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

More information is needed to clarify why Radiance Academy of Learning and Shekinah Radiance Academy do not have the goal of having 100% highly effective principal and teachers, but every other school does.

The data included ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures, but it failed to included (a) rational, (b) measure, or (c) review and improve narratives or evidence for all areas preK- 12.

Pre-K- 3, 4-8, and 9-12 all pertain very ambitious yet achievable target data for both an academic growth and a non-cognitive indicator of growth.

4-8 and 9-12 data to show college and career ready indicators were included.

An extremely low % of students who complete and submit the FAFSA form is included on the 9-12 chart. More information for justification to the very low numbers targeted would make this a stronger application.

Overall, the target data and performance measures are reasonable for almost every area but narratives are missing from the application. Therefore, this places George Gervin in the middle range of points.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

George Gervin has included a very extensive and detailed plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the investments of the RTT-D funds. Many layers, evaluations, types of data will be monitored to determine the effectiveness of the funding trainings, activities, and resources. Utilizing the Wexfor inc. company to gather the data in combination with the Return on Investment monetary measurement indicates a strong desire to ensure funds are properly spend. Reporting to all stakeholders, including the Department of Education appears to be very important to George Gervin as evident in their proposed model for continuous progress monitoring and trouble shooting identification and adjustments. Therefore, George Gervin will receive full points for having a very detailed and high quality plan in this area.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) George Gervin has successfully documented that the funds to support the project will be provided by 5 different State and Federal funds.</p> <p>(b) It is unclear the logic on principal and teacher incentive payouts awards. Specifically, if the purpose of the application is to increase the number of effective teachers, why is the cost decreasing from \$512,000 in year one to \$375,000 in year four for the EEP? If more teachers are becoming highly effective and earn the incentive, then more money would need to be paid out.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to why the PAP parent program and training funds will decrease every year. Also, it is unclear what will happen to the funds if the amount of parents participating (to receive the stipend) if the number projected is higher or lower than the amount proposed. Where will the additional money come from to cover this or where (and why) where the surplus be shifted if this allotment is too great?</p> <p>For professional development, George Gavin will be training the trainer which is an excellent way to spend the funds efficiently.</p> <p>More explanation would be needed to explain why the LEAs can pay for the Action 100 contract for year 3 and 4, but not year 1 and 2.</p> <p>The cost for the 5 master educators at \$30,000 is too low if this is a full time position. More information is needed if this is a full time position or if these duties are in addition to being an instructor at the school currently.</p> <p>The remaining budget items are comprehensive and solid.</p> <p>(c) The explanation of the additional funds are reasonable and well explained and total revenue is documented. George Gervin clearly states for each part of the budget if it is a one-time investment or ongoing cost. It is however unclear throughout the budget how the LEA's will ensure long-term sustainability of personalized learning environments.</p> <p>Overall, the numbers represented in the budget are sound for most of the budget. Some of the categories are decreasing with no explanation as to why. Therefore, this places George Gervin in the middle of the medium range of points.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The sustainability of the proposed budget for (F)(1) for George Gavin is confusing and inadequate. George Gavin included many excellent goals which included objectives, measurement/effectiveness Data, and Deliverables/Timeline/Responsible party, but it failed to show a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.</p> <p>There was no evidence of support from the State and local government leaders or financial support.</p> <p>Therefore, George Gervin place at the bottom of the low range because it did not clearly prove sustainability.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. George Gervin documents a significant about of partnerships already established for the schools involved. Many key members of the community are already serving as trainers, mentors, speakers, etc. It is clear that George Gavin LEA's have already worked hard to gain the partnership of local law enforcement and wrap around services such as before and after school enrichment and health care services. 90% of the LEA's started off as non-profits service providers, which is definitely a strength for this application.
2. George Gervin's 9 desired results are convincing and do show alignment with RTT-D plan. All of the 9 desired results clearly show the connection between strong families, strong communities, and strong schools.
3. The tracking indicators included are reasonable and achievable. The targeted data will be able to be used as a resource for determining an Individualized Educational Plan for any and all students. It is unclear how the school-site resource coordinating teams and multi-site resource coordinating councils will assist in developing strategies that allow this model to expand. However, by reducing fragmentation of the programs available, this shows how results could and should improve over time.
4. It is unclear how the partnerships and participating schools will actually integrate education and other services for participating students. This part of the application lacks clear description and evidence.
5. George Gervin's desire to attract more professional services to ensure a high qualified staff that can assist in identifying the needs of the students is a strong idea. By assigning the School-site resource coordinating teams and the multi-site resource coordinating councils the goal of aligning the RTT-D plan to that of the social emotional performance measure of each student, the schools will be provided with adequate tools to identify and inventory the needs and assets of the community and school. The plan allows for parents to be involved at the individual level and school level if so desired. George Gervin appears to have a solid plan in place for assessing the progress by evaluating all practices by monitoring results and performances.
6. George Gervin presents a strong desire to identify performance measures with a key focus on early intervention in yr 1, 2, 3, and 4. These performance measures are of high quality as early identification of developmental and mental health issues in young children prevents more serious issues in the later years.

Overall, it is clear that George Gervin and the LEA's have a strong community support system, the plan does not strongly and clearly show how these community connections will be integrated to meet the needs of all students, especially high needs students. Therefore, this places George Gervin in the top of the medium range of points.

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Overall, George Gervin has met Absolute Priority 1. George Gervin was clear in adopting reformed standard and assessments for all of the LEA's that will ensure college and career readiness for all students. The "Data Notebook" will ensure that students are growing and succeeding and that all students, parents and educators will be trained to understand and apply the data to personalize education. The educator and principal review system is a quality indication of necessary reform to ensure that highly effective teachers and principals are rewarded for closing the achievement gap and staying in the classroom where they are most needed and influential for all students. The online resources and contracts collectively account for a feasible plan to turn around all school that are part of the George Gervin LEA.

Total	210	142
-------	-----	-----

## Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	1

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Although George Gervin included an optional budget supplement, it is not a clear and justified proposal. It asks for an additional 2 million dollars for 4,500 students to participate in the community partnerships program, but it does not fully explain what it is or why it is important. The plan lacks rationale and a high quality plan for carrying out the activities. Therefore, this will result in points in the bottom of the low range.